

(9)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA 1478/2001

New Delhi, this the 12th day of November, 2001

Hon'ble Shri Govindan S.Tampi, Member (A)

Shri Anil Tyagi  
Junior Telecom Officer  
Shahdara East Telephone Exchange  
Ghaziabad Telephone District  
R/o House No.138, New Arya Nagar  
Meerut Road  
Ghaziabad (UP).

...Applicant

(By Advocate Shri S.N.Anand)

V E R S U S

UNION OF INDIA : THROUGH

- 1.. Secretary  
Ministry of Communications  
(Deptt. of Telecommunications)  
20, Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road  
New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Chief General Manager  
UP West Telecom Circle  
Dehra Dun (UP).
3. The General Manager  
Ghaziabad Telephone District  
Ghaziabad.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Shri M.M.Sudan alongwith  
Shri Rajiv Sharma)~

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Shri Govindan S.Tampi,

In this case, what the applicant seeks are the revocation of his suspension as well as the review of the same.

2. The applicant in this case is a Junior Telecom Officer, who has been trapped by the CBI for accepting a bribe of Rs.1000/- (Rs. one thousand) on 11-7-2000 and who has been kept in police custody for more than 48 hours leading to his deemed suspension w.e.f. 11-7-2000. It has been shown by the learned counsel for the applicant that review of the suspension is not taking place though one review has

(2)

-2-

occurred and the person is drawing the subsistence allowance @ 75 % of his basic pay. The learned counsel has invited my attention to the case of Bani Singh Vs. UOI and Ors. in OA 833/2000 disposed of on 6-2-2001 and states that a considerable time has gone by the suspension has to be revoked.

3. On behalf of the respondents Shri Rajiv Sharma, learned proxy counsel pointed out that this is not the case where the suspension should be revoked keeping in mind the present circumstances.

4. I have considered the matter and I am convinced that the circumstances of the case are such that the applicant's request for revoking suspension need not be accepted. It would send a wrong signal and would give rise to a spate of such requests. However, it would be for the respondents to finalize the investigation fast and to do the needful.

5. In the above view of the matter, the OA is dismissed in limine. However, while doing so the respondents are advised to ensure that the investigations are finalised as early as possible i.e. within six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and that timely reviews of the suspension <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ undertaken, as provided under Rules. 2

(GOVINDAN S. TAMPI)  
MEMBER (A)

/vikas/